



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,880	06/14/2005	Hidehiro Uematsu	7217/73586	5121

530 7590 08/24/2006

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUNG THANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2841

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/538,880

Applicant(s)

UEMATSU ET AL.

Examiner

HUNG T. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2841

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: unclear regarding what is included or excluded by the claim language. Rejection follow as best understood. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Childers (US 6,452,096) in view of Buckshaw et al. (US 5,065,972).

Regarding claim 1: Childers discloses in figure 1, a casing body (50) having a small boss (20, 22, 26) for canceling a sharp edge in a casing that has the sharp edge in a part with which a user's hand can come into contact in view of a design of a casing. Childers does not disclose the small boss is provided at a position that allows a force concentrated on one point of the sharp edge to be directed away in the vicinity of the sharp edge.

Buckshaw discloses in figure 1, the small boss is provided at a position that allows a force concentrated on one point of the sharp edge to be directed away in the vicinity of the sharp edge.

Art Unit: 2841

Childers and Buckshaw et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor to make edge protection.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make protection of Childers to have boss as taught by Buckshaw for the benefit of protecting from being hurt.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 2: Childers discloses all of the casing body as described above with respect to claim 1 except, Childers does not disclose the casing body is a casing of an audio device including a main body and a front surface panel having steps in outer sides from an upper surface and side surfaces of the main body, and the sharp edge is formed on a corner part of a rear end face of the front surface panel. There would be no motion to make this modification.

Relevant Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Childers (US 6,452,096) teaches the edge protector, Buckshaw et al. (US 5,065,972) teaches the corner bumper, Klohn (US 5,217,319) teaches the metal edge, Mason (US 4,817,902) teaches the corner protection, Chmela et al. (US 6,044,601) teaches the soft edge, Kiethley, Jr. (US 4,940,009) teaches the cushion, Waterman (US 4,883,281) teaches the vertical bumper.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-5983. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KAMMIE CUNEO can be reached on 571-272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

HN

Hung Thanh Nguyen

8/20/06



KAMAND CUNEO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800